



Meeting Notes

Signage Focus Group Meeting

8:30 a.m. – Thursday, June 25, 2009

APS Conference Room, 101 West Cherry Ave, Flagstaff, AZ

1. Welcome and Introductions

Meeting was called to order by Chair Phil Keesee at 8:30 a.m.

In attendance:

Ed Larsen, City of Flagstaff
Gerry Craig
Phil Scandura
Chuck Ley, City of Flagstaff
Steve Nelson
Hillarie Nickerson
Craig Watkins

Amy Sinsheimer (consultant)
Mark Sawyers, City of Flagstaff
Neil Gullickson, City of Flagstaff
Greg Brooks, City of Flagstaff
Crystal Bowen
Lisa Wise (consultant)

2. Recap of Focus Group Purpose

As part of the third meeting, the Chair did a quick introduction around the room for any new faces. Phil Keesee as wanted to reinforce the purpose of the focus group and to push forward on resolving issues.

Chair Keesee shared with the Signage Focus Group the results and discussion of the first Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) that he attended the previous day for the Chairs and Vice Chairs. Some of the key thoughts revolved around duplication between various groups and how the CAG had decided to deliver the final results on time that they would have to meet weekly. He reminded those in attendance that their purpose to provide input on what they would like to see changed, refined or added to the code and forward that to the Consultant. He also asked whether it was felt there was a need meet on a weekly basis because of the time left and number of un-resolved issues.

3. Discussion:

At the last meeting the Group came up with a list of issues for consideration they were asked to list their top five issues for further discussion. [Like many of the Focus Groups, there was a slow response to provide a list of the "top five" issues, so it was decided to take about 20-25 minutes to prioritize these issues.] The Group came up with the following:

1. Review process (clarification, consistency) (7)

2. Aesthetic (definition)(where are standards) (4)

Letter height

3. Off site signage (6)

4. New technology – marquee signage (4)

-community signs/kiosk – LED signs – lumens

-Output – colors/logos – diffusers, animation,

5. Design enhancements (3)

6. Height & size (6)

7. Transects (need briefing)

8. Sign illumination – sustainability- dark skies (3)

1. Architecture as a sign (4)

2. Variances (process & procedures group) This was included with #1 Review process

3. Major or minor road definition (2)

4. Test new code with scenarios – This was decided as a resolved issue.

5. Fee Schedule (1)

6. Amendment (exceptions) – This was included with #1 Review process

7. Impact on trees/resources (1)

Mr. Keesee reminded the attendees that just because something didn't rank high on the list of importance for first to be discussed, that those issues would still be discussed at a later meeting and were not forgotten.

The Group proceeded to the discussion of the Review process.

Review Process

- Amendments (exceptions need to be clearly defined to minimize different answers)
- Variances – legal allowances – special circumstances
 - Board of Adjustments
 - Administrative waivers (limited) (amendment to) - Better defined process.
 - Comprehensive sign code – Mr Nelson was concerned on how this process worked with the Auto Mall and felt that it might bring more applicants in for "off site" signage in the future
 - Progress to P&Z
 - Appeals process (needs to be clearly defined as it applies to signage)
- More graphic/illustration (better flow diagrams & clear definitions for issues such as how a designer gets larger signs through "enhancements" to the basic sign)
- Look at past variances and appeals (this was a suggestion to have either the group or the Consultant to review the few appeals made to see if it was being applied consistently)
- The group did discuss briefly the six amendments since the sign code was adopted in 1997 and various changes. Current LDC lists the ordinance and date to the specific code section; but it requires researching each portion to find out what the change was. The group made some suggestions that amendments to portions of the Zoning Code needed to be summarized in a specific location and then could be footnoted.

As part of the review process, the group noted that design professionals (such as Architects for production retail and commercial spaces) do not review our sign codes and are always designing buildings with specific signage and then learn it can't be done. As part of the review process (site plans, etc.) it was suggested that the sign issue needs to be addressed sooner and not later.

4. Transect overview

An overview of Transect planning was presented by Mr. Roger Eastman with a short video.

5. Other

Mr. Eastman offered a suggestion to the Group that he work with the Chair and Vice-Chair along with the consultant to consolidate some of the issues to help move the discussion along using the S.W.O.T analysis. It was pointed out that this is what the Group has done in prioritizing the issues. It was decided that the Group would meet every week to be able to get their recommendations to the Consultant by the end of July.

6. Next Meeting: Thursday, July 2, 2009, 8:30 a.m. at a location to be determined. Mr. Eastman will e-mail a reminder along with meeting notes.

7. Adjournment at 10:00 a.m.